

**REMARKS**

The specification and claims have been carefully reviewed in the light of the Office Action to which this amendment is responsive. By this amendment, the claims have been amended to improve their form and to distinguish even more clearly over the prior art. At the outset, an effort has been made to correct each of the informalities raised by the Examiner. In this regard, with respect to Paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the recitation "at least one nozzle orifice" is intended to be generic to one or more nozzle orifices, consistent with normal claim drafting. Claim 39 has been amended in an effort to clarify that the housing is formed with two of said nozzle orifices. With respect to Paragraph 6 of the Office Action, while it is believed that the claim as previously presented was not indefinite when read in the light of the patent disclosure (see for example, Pg. 9, ll. 13-20), the claim has been amended in an effort to also clarify this aspect of the claimed invention.

Claims 4-6, 8-10, 12-16, 35, 37, 39 and 42 stand rejected as being anticipated by Jones (10,051) and claims 3, 36, 38, 40, 41 and 43 have been rejected as being obvious over that reference. Reconsideration of such rejections is respectfully requested. As brought out in the prior prosecution, applicant has disclosed and claimed a novel rotary nozzle adapted for high efficiency cleaning applications. The nozzle assembly includes a rotary nozzle housing that is driven by a torque generated by fluid directed through the nozzle housing, but in contrast to prior art rotary nozzles, is adapted for high pressure cleaning without rotating the nozzle at such high speeds as to diminish cleaning effectiveness.

The nozzle housing of the present invention includes at least one nozzle orifice that is oriented for directing liquid outwardly of the housing, as an incident to the direction of pressurized fluid through the housing, but not in a non-radial direction that would oppose rotation of the housing. In other words, the discharging spray would not have a directional component opposite that of the direction of rotation. Consistent with

In re Appln. of Feller et al.  
Application No. 09/785,9620

the invention, the housing further includes a breaking discharge orifice oriented for directing liquid outwardly of the housing in a non-radial direction opposite to the direction of rotation of the housing. In other words, this opening directs the liquid spray with a directional component thereof opposite to the direction of housing rotation, which retards rotation of the nozzle housing as an incident to the direction of higher pressurized liquids through the nozzle.

In Jones, on the other hand, the rotary casing B has a plurality of discharge orifices C each oriented in similar relation. Jones provides no appreciation or suggestion for a rotary nozzle having one nozzle orifice for generating a predetermined spray discharge and differently oriented breaking discharge opening for retarding rotary movement at higher liquid pressures.

Hence, claim 35 as now presented is believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art. Since the remaining claims in issue all are dependent upon claim 35, for similar reasons they are believed to be allowable. Accordingly, early action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Dennis R. Schlemmer, Reg. No. 24,703  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: November 3, 2003